



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

middle of the tenth century, between the *Menologium* and the Benedictine *Officium*.

Dr. Cook is unwilling wholly to surrender the Alfredian authorship of the prose division of the Psalter. He gives Bruce's view that it was the work of an ignorant priest, soon, if at all, after the date of Alfred; and Wülfing's view that it was the work of Alfred, on the basis of a statement of William of Malmesbury. Whilst acknowledging that there is no resemblance between the *Paris Psalter* and Alfred's undoubted works, he finds in two passages, in two usages peculiar to Alfred a slender foundation. "It will require," says Dr. Cook,

"a more comprehensive and detailed examination to decide whether Alfred is really to be credited with the translation of all the prose Psalms extant." "There is nothing in Bruce's arguments which necessarily militates against the theory of Alfredian authorship, since it is notorious that the king was assisted by clerical collaborators in much of his scholarly activity."

The Northumbrian glosses receive in the *Conspectus*, as might be expected from Dr. Cook's special studies, a very full treatment in a most interesting account.

No where else will the scholar find so full and complete a statement of Ælfric's identity, in which as to the date of the *Homilies* (889-890) an error, no doubt typographical, occurs.

No question of importance in the history of O.E. Biblical literature is left untouched; upon each is given a statement more full and complete than can be found elsewhere. It brings the achievements of O.E. scholarship down to the present, and so provides for the "Advancement of O.E. Learning."

It is in this connection that we have the most important service of the collection of Biblical Quotations in the light thrown by them upon the method and extent of Biblical instruction in the O.E. Church. These questions are left in obscurity in Lingard, Soames, and other writers.

A cursory examination of the quotations, which are of the tenth century, seem to support the view that the Bible was not first given to the Angles and Saxons in direct translation. The conditions which led to the first Teutonic version of Ulfilas from the original Greek had passed away at the time of the conversion of the Saxons. The Latin versions had acquired

the sacredness and authority to a high degree they have since enjoyed in the Roman communion. The Anglo-Saxon clergy would be disposed to acquire a knowledge of the scriptures first in the study of the Latin version. In the popular instruction, use would naturally be made of the existing institution of minstrelsy in poetical paraphrase, and the oral exposition of the preacher. In this way a scriptural diction and phrase would arise. The necessities of the church service would call for the translation of those parts of the scripture which belong to the people in the liturgy, the Psalter, Canticles, the Paternoster, as Bæda's injunction to Egbert would seem to support. The neglect and ignorance of Latin among the clergy of the ninth century would give rise to the glosses. Not until the tenth century, in the closing period of O.E. literature, have we known efforts at direct translation into the vernacular, and these find their moving cause in the lectionary of the church service. The quotations seem to show, in the freedom and independence in which they are made, that down into the tenth century, no vernacular translation beyond traditional oral usage had become recognized in any one version.

Dr. Cook's work opens a rich mine of material, and in the fine scholarship in which it is edited, is a most valuable contribution to O.E. studies.

CHARLES EDWARD HART.

Rutgers College.

ENGLISH POETRY.

Milton's Paradise Lost; Its Structure and Meaning, by JOHN A. HINES, Professor of English in Pennsylvania College. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1898.

PROFESSOR HINES informs us that the views embodied in this work came upon him as a genuine surprise, and we may be pretty sure that there is much about them that will be surprising to the reader. He assures us that despite all the study bestowed upon it, *Paradise Lost* "is even now but poorly understood;" and certainly, if his interpretations be correct, he has put the case very mildly—he might have said "is not understood by anybody."

The present reviewer—in common, he supposes, with most ordinary persons—has always thought that the narrative in Genesis, and the ancient tradition of the fall of the angels, furnished the poet with his subject; but he now learns that this is all wrong: “not the first book but the last of the sacred volume contains the framework of the poem.” It is, we now learn, an expansion of the seven trumpets of the Apocalypse, and we are carefully notified at what parts of the poem the respective soundings occur.

From this apocalyptic beginning one naturally expects strange things and marvellous unfoldings. Should we attempt any detailed examination of this commentator's mode of forcing strange interpretations upon seemingly simple statements, we should run the risk of tiring our reader's patience; so we will let one example suffice to show the method. The matter in hand is the erection of Pandemonium; the immediate theses are that Satan is Apollyon, therefore Apollo, and that Pandemonium is Papal Rome. He works thus:—Milton compares the fallen angels (I, 613) to blasted oaks and pines. “The oracle of Apollo at Cumae is established in the neighborhood of a dense forest of pines and oaks (*Aen.* vi, 180). It is plain, therefore, that Milton had Cumae and Apollo in his mind. Now follow carefully. We are presently told of a burning hill (670), of a plain (700) where, under the direction of Mammon, (who we are told is Jupiter, though Milton identifies him with Hephaistos or Mulciber), a palace is erected, which is Papal Rome. Here are the commentator's words:—“The scene widens from Cumae” [oak and pines] “first south to Vesuvius” [burning hill] “then north into the Campania” [plain] “until in the erection of the infernal Capitol it reaches Rome.” All roads lead to Rome, a proverb says, but surely this is one of the oddest.

Of the multitude of inept and irrelevant notes we shall cite but a single one. Milton (II, 880) says that the infernal gates, to let Satan pass, fly open

“With impetuous recoil and jarring sound.” On which the Professor has this luminous note:—

“*Recoil.* After long detention in the ‘iron furnace’ of Egypt, the children of Israel were thrust out, (*Exod.* xi, i). The recoil of Hell-gates is like the sudden urgency of the Egyptians after their sullen resistance.”

The present reviewer will cheerfully present his copy of the book to any one, Professor Hines included, who will explain the meaning or relevancy of this note.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—May I avail myself of your columns for addressing a request to all your readers interested especially in English philology? For some months past I have been engaged upon a bibliography of the study, getting titles and subjects entered upon catalogue-cards. The Cornell collection of books and periodicals is fairly good; certainly for recent years. But we are not blessed with everything. I should be extremely obliged, therefore, for information upon:—

a. Early literature, edd. etc., not recorded, for Oldest English, in Wülker's *Grundriss*.

b. Periodicals containing articles of value. Here I should like title in full, editor(s), publisher, date when the periodical was begun, etc. Thus, is the *Museum, Maanblad voor Philologie*, etc., edd. Blok, Speijer, Sijmons. Groningen; Wolters (begun 1893); to be had in this country? Or, *Tidskrift, nordisk, för Filologi?*

By “philology” I understand not merely linguistics, but authors, literature, *Kultur*, etc., coming down certainly to the Tudor period. Chaucer, however, I am unable to attack exhaustively.

While my pen is in, let me indite a few strictures upon the “sloppy” manner in which Petri has prepared the *Uebersicht*, etc. (1894) as Supplement-heft to the *Anglia* 1896-7. To begin, the editor might simplify and classify his references, to the great comfort of his readers, by using abbreviations. Why such ponderous entries as, p. 15, bottom, Sievers (E), Zur